

## REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed and considered the Non-Final Office Action and the references cited therein. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are amended; Claims 9, 19, and 20 are canceled; and Claims 21 and 22 are added. As a result, Claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, and 22 are now pending in this application.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office indicates Claim 1 refers to “retrieving ... persistence layer values” and asserts that it is unclear what the persistence layer values refer to.

Claim 1, as amended herein, no longer contains the language that the Office asserts is unclear. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claims 1-8 and 10-18 are Allowable

The Office has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065739 (“Florance”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,451 (“Mukundan”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Neither the cited portions of Florance nor the cited portions of Mukundan teach or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Florance and Mukundan do not teach or suggest an application layer offering services to applications with the services including “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as recited in Claim 1.

In contrast to Claim 1, the cited portions of Florance, teach away from the above-identified “notifying” element of Claim 1. Florance states that the “contact management system directs the data mining applications to conduct continuous *pollings* of the data sources to update the real estate data.” Florance, paragraph 155 (emphasis added). Thus, Florance expressly teaches polling, rather than “notifying” as in Claim 1. Notifying can be less costly than polling. See Specification, paragraph 1026.

Additionally, neither the cited portions of Florance nor the cited portions of Mukundan teach or suggest updates to a property for which there are “applications having a variable dependent on” the property. In contrast to Claim 1, Florance teaches polling data sources to update real estate data.

The cited portions of Mukundan do not teach or suggest an application layer offering a service to applications including a service of “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as in Claim 1. Rather, Mukundan teaches an exchange between a client and a server. See Mukundan, FIG. 41 and column 42, line 60 to column 43, line 9. In Mukundan, a client detects whether values in marked fields have changed and then sends the changed values to a server for processing. Mukundan, column 1-6. The server processes the changes and responds to the client. Mukundan, column 43, lines 6-9.

The cited portions of Florance and Mukundan do not teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-8 and 10-18 depend from Claim 1 and are also allowable for the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Additionally, neither the cited portions of Florance nor the cited portions of Mukundan teach or suggest the specific combination of Claim 21. For example, the cited portions of Florance and Mukundan do not teach or suggest “notifying an application layer,” the application layer offering services to applications with the services including “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as recited in Claim 21.

In contrast to Claim 21, the cited portions of Florance, teach away from the above-identified “notifying” elements of Claim 21. Florance states that the “contact management system directs the data mining applications to conduct continuous *pollings* of the data sources to update the real estate data.” Florance, paragraph 155 (Emphasis added). Thus, Florance expressly teaches polling, rather than “notifying” as in Claim 21. Notifying can be less costly than polling. See Specification, paragraph 1026.

Additionally, the references do not teach or suggest updates to a property for which there are “applications having a variable dependent on” the property. In contrast to Claim 21, Florance teaches polling data sources to update real estate data.

The cited portions of Mukundan do not teach or suggest “notifying an application layer,” the application layer offering services to applications with the services including “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as recited in Claim 21. In contrast to Claim 21, Mukundan teaches an exchange between a client and a server. See Mukundan, FIG. 41 and column 42, line 60 to column 43, line 9. In Mukundan, a client detects whether values in marked fields have changed and then sends the changed values to a server for processing. Mukundan, column 43, lines 1-6. The server processes the changes and responds to the client. Mukundan, column 43, lines 6-9.

The cited portions of Florance and Mukundan do not teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 21. Accordingly, Claim 21 is allowable.

Finally, neither the cited portions of Florance nor the cited portions of Mukundan teach or suggest the specific combination of Claim 22. For example, the cited portions of Florance and Mukundan to not teach or suggest “computer-readable program code executable by a computer system to: … “notify an application layer,” the application layer offering services to applications with the services including “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as recited in Claim 22.

In contrast to Claim 22, the cited portions of Florance, teach away from the above-identified elements of Claim 22. Florance states that the “contact management system directs the data mining applications to conduct continuous *pollings* of the data sources to update the real estate data.” Florance, paragraph 155 (Emphasis added). Thus, Florance expressly teaches polling, rather than “notifying” as in Claim 22. Notifying can be less costly than polling. See Specification, paragraph 1026.

Additionally, the references do not teach or suggest updates to a property for which there are “applications having a variable dependent on” the property. In contrast to Claim 22, Florance teaches polling data sources to update real estate data.

The cited portions of Mukundan do not teach or suggest “computer-readable program code executable by a computer system to: … notify an application layer,” the application layer offering services to applications with the services including “notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received” as recited in Claim 22. In contrast to Claim 22, Mukundan teaches an exchange between a client and a server. See Mukundan, FIG. 41 and column 42, line 60 to column 43, line 9. In Mukundan, a client detects whether values in marked fields have changed and then sends the changed values to a server for processing. Mukundan, column 43, lines 1-6. The server processes the changes and responds to the client. Mukundan, column 43, lines 6-9.

The cited portions of Florance and Mukundan do not teach or suggest at least one element of Claim 22. Accordingly, Claim 22 is allowable.

### Conclusion

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references applied in the Non-Final Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

June 18, 2008

Date

  
Jason L. Moore, Reg. No. 52,046

Attorney for Applicant(s)

TOLER LAW GROUP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES  
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5575 (fax)